	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/812,119	LIPSCOMB ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James M. Hewitt	3679
All Participants:	Status of Application: _	
(1) James M. Hewitt.	(3)	
(2) <u>John Lazarus</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 25 May 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1-3, 11, 14, 16-17, 20-21, 28-34  Prior art documents discussed: Yokomatsu (EP 0 310 234) and Ramspott (DE 42 16 168)  Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	\S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a write record of the substance of the	tten summary of the substance e interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	nt/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)
	• •	- '' '

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Applicant's representative and the Examiner agreed to amending the claims as reflected in the accompanying Examiner's Amendment in order to distinguish the claims over the prior art, particularly Yokomatsu (EP 0 310 234) and Ramspott (DE 42 16 168). Claims 16, 28 and 33 were agreed to be canceled to obviate a 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection. Claims 20, 29 and 34 were agreed to be canceled to obviate a 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection as well as a 35 USC 112 1st pararaph (new matter) rejection. The specification was agreed to be amended in order to correct certain informalities.